

**ARIZONA JUDICIAL COUNCIL'S
LIMITED JURISDICTION COURTS COMMITTEE**

Arizona State Courts Building
Conference Room 119A & B
Phoenix, AZ 85007
February 25, 2004

Members Attending:

Honorable R. Michael Traynor, Chair
Honorable John Kennedy, Vice Chair
Honorable George Anagnost
Ms. Faye Coakley
Honorable Judy Ferguson
Honorable Linda Hale
Mr. Don Jacobson
Mr. Theodore Jarvi
Honorable R. Wayne Johnson

Ms. Pamela Jones
Honorable John Lamb
Honorable Michael Lester
Honorable Kathy McCoy
Mr. Dale Poage
Honorable Antonio Riojas, Jr.
Mr. James Scorza
Mr. Paul Thomas

Absent Members: (excused)

Ms. Kathy Barrett
Honorable Sherry Geisler

Ms. Joan Harphant
Honorable R.O. McDaniel

Staff:

Ms. Susan Pickard

Ms. Valerie Tillman

Presenter/Guests:

Ms. Theresa Barrett
Mr. David Benton
Ms. Evelyn Buckner
Mr. C. Daniel Carson
Ms. Janet Cornell
Mr. Mike DiMarco
Mr. Greg Eades
Ms. Debby Finkel

Ms. Page Gonzales
Mr. Karl Heckart
Ms. Karen Kretschman
Ms. Lynn Marcus (via phone)
Honorable Mark Moran
Mr. Rick Rager
Mr. Robert Roll
Mr. Ted Wilson

REGULAR BUSINESS

1. CALL TO ORDER

With a quorum present, Judge Traynor called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

Mr. Frank Maiocco has resigned his position on the committee. Mr. Don Jacobson has been appointed to fulfill the remainder of Mr. Maiocco's term. This is the second term for Mr. Jacobson.

The terms for the following committee members will expire in June 2004: Judge Anagnost, Judge Lester, Judge Lamb, Judge Geisler, Judge Ferguson, Judge McDaniel, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Poage, Ms. Jones, Ms. Coakley and Mr. Jarvi. Ms. Pickard has sent an email to each of these members requesting their interest in being considered for re-appointment to the committee. Judge Traynor requested that members respond to Ms. Pickard as soon as possible.

2. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 19, 2003 MEETING MINUTES

Judge Traynor asked if there were any changes or corrections to the November LJC meeting minutes. No corrections were made.

Motion: Motion was made by Judge Lester and seconded by Judge Kennedy **to approve the minutes for the November 19, 2003 LJC meeting** as presented. Motion passed unanimously.
LJC-04-01.

INFORMATION/POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS

3. PENDING AND PROPOSED RULES UPDATE

Ms. Patience Huntwork was unable to attend the meeting. This agenda item was not presented/discussed.

4. EXECUTIVE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Issues covered:

- HB 2019 DUI/OUI Fines; Department of Corrections Overcrowding Fund - This bill was passed in special session and becomes effective March 13, 2004. Judge Traynor urged members to pay close attention to the fees and be aware that surcharges, fines and assessments for these violations cannot be waived.
- ADR Grant Update - Ms. Karen Kretschman updated the subcommittee on the progress of various recommendations.

5. FARE PROGRAM UPDATE - STANDING REPORT

Mr. Mike DiMarco (AOC) reported on the FARE Program.

- Over \$910,000 (9% of the dollar amount submitted) has been collected from the 27,000 cases in the Interim FARE process.
- Of the 27,000 cases submitted, 20,000 have sufficient data for notification.
- Pay by Web is now available. Collection to date is \$22,000, 25% of which are payments from out-of-state.
- No more courts will be brought into Interim FARE. The first court to come online with full FARE will be the City of Phoenix, which will come online toward the end of April.

Mr. DiMarco discussed an anonymous letter which has been distributed to leaders in city, county and state government offices and courts. He addressed the issues regarding FARE and ACS raised in the letter.

6. ADR GRANT UPDATE

Ms. Karen Kretschman (AOC) gave a brief history on the fund and update on the recommendations and findings regarding the suggested usage of the justice court portion of the ADR fund. The new focus of the grant is to expand educational efforts for justice courts and justices of the peace to establish or expand ADR programs. The AOC is not interested in training judges to be mediators, but to provide them with expertise in designing and implementing ADR programs in the justice court system.

- Scholarships to the National Judicial College in Reno - Declined due to the mediator focus and expense of the training.
- In-State training provided by the National Judicial College - Declined due to expense and 100 participant minimum.
- ADR session at New Judge Orientation and the Annual Judicial Conference. The AOC is currently in discussion with the Office of the Attorney General.
- Justice of the Peace ADR Training Survey - Sent a survey to assist the AOC in determining the type of ADR training the justices of the peace would be interested in. Five responses have been received as of yesterday. All five are very interested in the training described.
- Utilizing Existing Superior Court Programs in Justice Court - The idea is to expand superior court programs so that a justice of the peace can call the superior court ADR coordinator or individual in charge to schedule a mediator if they have a case that could benefit from mediation. For counties that do not have a program at the superior court level, it may be possible to create intergovernmental agreements with counties that have mediator pools. To followup, an ADR Coordinators meeting has been scheduled for Monday. In addition to the ADR Coordinators, justice court administrators and individuals who might be interested in attending have also been invited.
- American Bar Association Seminar - AOC's Education Services Division is working on the arrangements for a week-long ABA ADR training seminar in November. The ABA will supply most of the faculty and the AOC would be assisting and identifying facilitators. There is a \$700 registration fee for this

training. The AOC is considering scholarships for justices of the peace to attend.

Ms. Kretschman asked that any further ideas for the use of the ADR grant funds be forwarded to her.

A suggestion was made to have persons from the five counties who have successful programs (Maricopa, Yavapai, Cochise, Mohave and Coconino) to participate in the session at the Judicial Conference.

7. COMMITTEE ON THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND THE COURTS (CIDVC) PROJECT STATUS

Domestic Violence Forms - Ms. Karen Kretschman (AOC) reported that the General Petition and Order of Protection and Injunction Guide Sheet were approved by Dave Byers on November 19, 2003. These forms were mandated for implementation by courts by February 1, 2004. Only the petition and the guide sheet are new, no other domestic violence forms were changed due to the impact on AZTEC. The forms, as well as a list of frequently asked questions have been posted to the AJB and AJIN web sites. Additionally, four fee waiver and deferral forms were updated to remove language that implied a filing fee domestic violence petitions. These forms are located on the AJB web site, for court personnel use. The web sites are as follows:

Domestic Violence Forms

<http://www.supreme.state.az.us/nav2/selfserv.htm>
<http://ajin/selfserv/formprotord.htm>

Frequently Asked Questions

<http://ajin/selfserv/GenPetFAQs.htm>

Fee Waiver/Deferral Forms

<http://www.supreme.state.az.us/fees/>

A concern regarding having enough space on the petition for the necessary information was raised. As long as a court is not adding, deleting or modifying the language or changing the sequence of the text of the General Petition, it is permissible for a local court to make cosmetic formatting changes (for example the font, margins, paragraph indentation, court address information). If you are uncertain whether or not the changes you want to make are merely cosmetic, please contact the AOC. Please note that the margins on the General Petition conform to A.R.C.P. Rule 10(d). Although no major changes can be made to the General Petition, it is permissible for courts to include additional information on the Guide Sheet, such as case number, Plaintiff's date of birth, Defendant's phone number and relationship to the Plaintiff. This question is also addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions.

Domestic Violence Criminal Benchbook - Judge Mark Moran, Coconino County

Superior Court and DV Criminal Benchbook Workgroup Chair, introduced the new Domestic Violence Criminal Benchbook approved by CIDVC. This project encompasses over two years of work by the workgroup as well the full committee of CIDVC and provides an important resource for judges regarding criminal domestic violence cases. This benchbook provides judges with a practical guideline/outline in a variety of areas from release conditions through trial including types of problems to anticipate at trial, probation, treatment requirements and compliance and a background for rules of evidence for domestic violence cases. It is important that judges give these cases the attention they deserve and feel confident in the decisions that they make. Judge Moran invited all comments and suggestions regarding the benchbook.

Domestic Violence Benchbook - Ms. Evelyn Buckner, Governor's Office for Children, Youth and Families and DV Benchbook Workgroup Chair, presented the updated Domestic Violence Benchbook. As with the DV Criminal Benchbook, the law in this area is continually changing. Annual updates of both benchbooks should be anticipated. Ms. Buckner invited all comments and suggestions regarding the benchbook.

Along with being distributed to all general and limited jurisdiction court judicial officers via CD, the benchbooks can be found on the AJB web site and through Wendell at:

<http://www.supreme.state.az.us/cidvc/dvbenchbook.htm>
<http://www.supreme.state.az.us/cidvc/PDF/CrimDVBB.pdf>

CPOR/LPOR - Mr. Robert Roll presented an update regarding CPOR/LPOR. The enhancements recommended for approval previously by this committee and AJC have been implemented. DPS conducted training for the Holders of Record. On January 22nd the program was moved into production in limited format (Holders of Record being able to bring up the electronic orders). DPS has stated that full functionality could be attained within 60-90 days. In addition to the query capabilities they now have, full functionality means the capability to update the LPOR record and acceptance of the record for submission to NCIC. Over 1 million queries (including protective order, license plate or wanted person queries) have been made since January 22. Of those, 2000 were direct queries against protective orders.

8. PRIORITY OF OFFENDER PAYMENTS IN LIMITED JURISDICTION COURTS

Ms. Debby Finkel (AOC) withdrew this item from the agenda.

9. COT UPDATE -STANDING REPORT

Mr. Karl Heckart provided the members of the committee with updated information regarding:

- The future of AZTEC
 - technological issues
- COT Plans

- identified packages that may suit limited jurisdiction courts' needs.
- no packages identified for general jurisdiction court.
- the Court Automation Coordinating Committee of COT will be seeking experts (20 teams) to set out the specific business requirements for systems analysis beginning with the limited jurisdiction courts and then moving on to general jurisdiction.
- a decision will be based upon three approaches
 - build custom
 - buy a system via RFP
 - borrow a system, specifically iCIS - good option for general jurisdiction - project plan and budget being developed - lacking a financial system
- Limited jurisdiction courts are in the process of working out their functional requirements it is anticipated that the specifications will be ready to base a decision on in late summer.
- iCIS in Pima County will come up in the fall and will then be reassessed.
- COT adopted technology standards to assist in technology sharing across the courts.
- New JOLTS will be constructed and implemented a piece at a time over the next 30 months.
- Adult Probation System designed for statewide use and currently only being used in Maricopa County due to funding issues. Should be rolled out over the next two years contingent upon the funding model.

10. FORMS/RULES SUBCOMMITTEE

Judge Anagnost provided the report for the Forms/Rules Subcommittee which included the following:

- Rule 1 - Boating While Intoxicated, Test Refusal - Included in the meeting materials was a draft petition to amend Rule 1 of Civil Rules of Traffic Procedure. Statutes have been amended to change the classification of the penalty for failure to submit to alcohol or drug testing after being cited for boating while intoxicated from a petty offense to a civil fine. The change in statute, effective September 18, 2003, will require that courts modify how they process a refusal under this section. Prior to this amendment, the Rules of Procedure in Traffic Cases and Boating Cases applied to such cases. In the absence of a criminal penalty, these rules no longer provide appropriate procedures for adjudicating these types of cases. Administrative Order (AO) 2003-99 was adopted as a temporary solution until suitable amendments to procedural rules can be prepared. The AO provides that the Rules of Procedure in Civil Traffic Violation Cases apply to these violations except that dispositions are not be reported to the Department of Transportation nor result in suspension of driving privileges, and cases shall be commenced within 60 days of the alleged violation or within 180 days if the alleged violation is under investigation in conjunction with an accident.

While a rule change has been drafted, the AOC has requested that the draft also include flying under the influence.

· Criminal Rule 14 - In Rule 14.1(a) there is reference to a time line of 10 days for arraignment after a charging document is filed. Unless the defendant is in custody, this is an unrealistic expectation for limited jurisdiction courts, (especially in cite and release cases). Judge Anagnost asked if the rule should be revised to make the time line more realistic and consistent with actual practice, especially in regards to defendants who are not in custody. He then deferred to Mr. Greg Eades (AOC).

Mr. Eades, after researching federal and other state rules could find no reference to deadlines for arraignments; however, he did find federal and California rules that required the state's attorney to provide a report for a defendant held more than 10 days before arraignment. Mr. Eades also consulted with the City of Phoenix Prosecutor's Office and Maricopa County Public Defenders Office. The prosecutors did not have a problem extending the 10-day period. The public defender's only objection was the possibility of the rule change impacting the speedy trial requirement. With the 180-day speedy trial deadline being counted from the date of arraignment, it was agreed that the rule change would not impact speedy trials. Courts with local fast track rules that start from the date of arrest or the date the case is filed, will be impacted; by adding two weeks to the time frame. This may cause a problem for the prosecutors and defenders. As it stands now neither the Maricopa Public Defender or City of Phoenix Prosecutors office has any objections to this.

Other reasons to extend the 10-day rule:

1. FARE project notification process effectiveness (citation, project processing, notification mailing, payment receipt) in cases where the citation includes criminal and civil traffic offenses.
2. Cases are pushing the 10-day rule and as a result when the tenth day falls on a Saturday, Sunday or holiday case volumes increase on Fridays, Mondays, and the days before or the days after the holiday. If the time frame were longer the court would have greater flexibility.
3. Blood test results time frame.

Concerns:

1. The in-custody defendant's waiting period if the rule is extended.
2. Affect on Title 13 and superior court.

The split rule for in-custody and out-of-custody could resolve the issues of defendant's rights, city and county custody funding and Title 13.

- Criminal Rule 26, Defendants Appearance at Sentencing

General analysis from Mr. Eades - Criminal Rule 26.9 requires a defendant's presence at sentencing. Criminal Appeals Rule 9(b) states if an appeal is denied a hearing can held to complete the sentencing but that can be done in absentia. Rule 9(b) is not consistent with the cases in Rule 26.9. It is clear that the court expects the defendant to be present at sentencing. The sentencing cannot occur until the defendant can be found and brought before the court. The Rule 26.9 mentions options in extenuating circumstances, but does not give examples. Mr. Eades came up with the following options:

- Deal with sentencing at time of conviction, so you do not have issues with the defendant not appearing for sentencing.
- Exempt out traffic cases if we can make an argument that might be extenuating circumstances where the defendant resides out of state and they are pleading by mail, it will be similar to arraignment and there is no requirement for personal appearance in traffic cases.
- Provide for some sort of waiver of the appearance requirement. Get that up front and allow the defendant to make a request for a personal appearance, and if they don't show up you have a waiver in hand that says you can proceed without them.

Fact scenarios that may not fit those analyzed:

- The defendant (lives in another state) is cited for DUI, tried, convicted, sentenced and appeals the conviction. While awaiting the decision on the appeal, the defendant is cited for a second DUI, tried, convicted, sentence and appeals. Both appeals are affirmed and the defendant refuses to return for post appeal re-imposition of sentence. Hence no record on either conviction.
- Person who enters into a plea agreement and asks for time for re-sentencing, defendant does not reappear for sentencing.
- Person driving on suspended license, takes a plea with judge setting sentencing out 30 days to give defendant time to have their license re-instated. Defendant chooses not to return for sentencing. The court has a conviction, but cannot impose a sentence.

The members asked Dan Carrion, representative from the public defenders office attending as a member of the public, to join them at the table for the discussion.

- Rule 17 - Ms. Lynn Marcus, Professor -University of Arizona Law School, joined the meeting via telephone. Ms. Marcus discussed immigration consequences of criminal convictions and provided a handout to the members containing a sampling of state cases from California, Wisconsin, the District of Columbia and Florida. There are many cases interpreting the various immigration consequences

advisement rules. California, with a high number of immigrants and many years (over 25) with such a rule, has a rich body of relevant cases. Some common themes among the cases include: 1) how broadly the statute is interpreted; 2) under what circumstances the remedy is used; 3) the effect of the statute on the responsibilities of defense counsel; 4) the elements required for compliance with the state; 5) prejudice; and 6) time limits for application of the remedy.

In immigration law, the definition of aggravated felony, as implemented in 1988, included murder and drug and weapons trafficking. Over time it has been expanded to include sexual abuse of a minor, and a second possession of drugs. Other deportable offenses include misdemeanor possession of drugs, domestic violence, misdemeanor paraphernalia possession. Depending on the person's background, a misdemeanor conviction could mean automatic deportation. This affects not only persons who are undocumented, married to a U.S. citizen or have U.S. citizen children, but those who have been in the country with lawful status since they were one or two days old or those who came as refugees.

These consequences are so grave that there is a trend among states to require courts to advise the defendant of the impact of conviction on immigration status. The advisement should extend to misdemeanor convictions since they, too, have immigration consequences. ABA standards suggest that judges should advise defendants of potential immigration consequences.

Ms Marcus suggested:

- A state hotline be developed to advise attorneys and parties on a case by case basis
- Amend Rule 14.3 for a general advisement for defendants who may immigration consequences.
- Amend Rule 17.2 to advise people of three possible consequences that they could face by entering a plea.
 1. Not be admissible to the United States
 2. Refused US citizenship
 3. Risk being deported.

This provision would require that judges give this advisement to all people without asking the individual's immigration status.

Concerns:

LJC Records Retention Schedule limits the time a file is kept by a court. What is meant by "absent a record"? Ms Marcus explained that the presumption is rebuttable and if there isn't a record of the conviction, in general the person may have a difficulty showing they have immigration consequences from a conviction that can't be established. Under immigration law to establish a conviction the Department of Homeland Security has to present a certified conviction document

certified by the issuing court. Generally, whatever computerized document that was saved that could be used to establish a conviction, could be saved in a format that shows the three-pronged advisement was given.

Reciting the entire advisement exactly as stated in the quotation in the petition. Ms. Marcus replied the judge should make sure that the three consequences are conveyed, but that it would not be necessary to use the exact wording.

Advisement during legal status process. Ms. Marcus noted that most people having been in permanent residence since they were very young, presume they are citizens. Many people immigrate when they are young, so they will not know this information when they are 35. An advisement at this time would not be effective.

Judge Lester suggested that the defendant be provided with a written advisement which could be read and signed.

Judge Kennedy agreed with Judge Lester and continued that the blanket advisement may offend the population who has no immigration consequences that appear before the court and dilutes the basic essential constitutional issues that are being conveyed at that time. He also noted the possible affect on the victim to have a case set-aside because the record of the advisement has been destroyed in accordance with records retention requirement.

Judge Anagnost added many of the citations provided in the Sampling of State Cases refer to statute which is a very important point. The California statue includes legislative findings. Legislative intent is explicitly put in the California code about this advisement. This is a substantive right, that should be addressed by the legislature and not the courts.

Motion: Motion made by Judge Lester and seconded by Judge Kennedy **to file a comment as discussed.** Motion was passed unanimously. **LJC-04-02**

Judge Anagnost was asked to draft the comment.

11. LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE - 2004 LEGISLATION

Mr. David Benton and Ms. Page Gonzales presented the following 2004 legislative update:

- HB 2215 Small Claims Hearing Officers - provides compensation to small claims hearing officers, only if funded by the county and a compensation schedule is approved by the presiding judge. A part of the AJC Packet. Passed House

Judiciary and Public Institutions and Counties. Held in Rules due concerns with including Maricopa County. The bill will be amended on the floor.

- HB 2223 Forcible Entry and Detainer Appeal - amends statute to conform to court rule, directing cost bonds and supersedeas bonds in forcible entry and detainer appeals to be paid in justice courts during pendency of the appeal of superior court. Passed House, 1st Read in Senate.
- HB 2216 MVD Registration Holds - enhances the ability to collect court-owed debt by strengthening the Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program (TTEAP) through MVD. The expansion would include delinquencies in paying victim restitution, fines, surcharges, penalties or assessments. A part of the AJC Packet. Assigned to Judiciary and Transportation.
The committee previously voted to include this bill in the AJC Packet, with restriction to Title 28 violations only. AJC, being advised of LJC concerns, voted to include the proposal as written.
- HB2377 Homeowners' Association Penalties; Notice Hearing - justices of the peace to have jurisdiction for persons contesting penalties from homeowners associations. An amendment to cover court concerns (filing fees, burden of proof, etc.) will be proposed on the floor.
- HB2310 Animal Mistreat; Procedures - allows an animal officer to request a justice of the peace hearing to determine whether an animal is being mistreated. The hearing shall be set within 10 days of a request. Floor amendments to be added addressing court concerns.
- HB2128 Courts Fees; Small Claims - increases the statutory fee for small claims service by mail in justice courts from \$3 to \$8. Signed by the Governor February 13, 2004.
- HB2647 Operating Watercraft Under Influence - adds an additional \$500 civil penalty (not subject to surcharge) for person operating a watercraft who refused to take an alcohol or drug test. The failure, refusal or neglect of a judicial officer to comply constitutes misconduct in office and is grounds for removal from office. Assigned to three committees and being held in primary committee based, in part, upon the language in the previous sentence.
- HB2260 Court Clerks, Funds, Report; - Strike everything: For requests under an amount determined by the Supreme Court, if the Supreme Court approves a strategic plan for spending monies from the State Aid to the Courts Fund and from the Local Courts Assistance Fund, the clerk, in agreement with the presiding judge of the superior court, may spend those monies pursuant to the plan without further approval. Directs the Auditor General to conduct a performance audit of the Administrative Office of the Courts. Passed House Judiciary.
- HB2261 - Withdrawn based on an agreement between the Arizona Association of Superior Court Clerks and the court. That agreement is found in HB2260.
- SB1049 Justice of the peace; presiding - in counties with two or more justice courts, the justice of the peace within that county shall periodically chose from among themselves a presiding justice of the peace to assume the duties of the presiding justice of the peace during the absence or inability to act of the presiding

justice of the peace. Passed out of the Senate with a companion bill proposed in the House.

- SCR1009 Justice of the peace pro tempore; qualifications - resolution to add to the 2004 general election ballot of 2004 the question of amending the state constitution to provide justices of the peace pro tempore need not be members of the Bar. Passed out of the Senate with a companion bill proposed in the House.
- SB1076 Justice of the peace pro tem - provides it is not necessary to be admitted to the practice of law to be appointed to serve as a justice of the peace pro tempore with a companion bill proposed in the House.
- SB1196 Reporting Requirements for Domestic Violence. Bill was defeated in Senate Judiciary.

HB2019 - Ted Wilson (AOC) presented information on HB2019 at the request of the Executive Subcommittee. HB2019 passed in special session in December, dealt with Department of Corrections (DOC) funding and appropriations, effective March 13, 2004. The bill created a new assessment DUI/OUI violations (driving, boating and flying). The monies from the assessment will be deposited in the Prison Overcrowding Fund. These monies will be used by DOC for prison construction and operations and to establish a pilot program to treat and rehabilitate drug offenders. These funds are not subject to surcharges but they are eligible for the 5% Fill the Gap set aside, the waiver of these assessments is not allowed. The new Part V of the Surcharge Question and Answer Guide and an additional appendix are being developed and updated effective March 13, 2004. Courts should contact their local treasurer to establish ~~some~~-line items or account codes for this particular fund; the AOC has made updates to the Court Revenue Surveys. The state treasurer will be updating the monthly remittance form, which will be distributed to the affected courts over the internet (April 1st). The benchbook will be updated to reflect these changes. The criminal code sentencing chart has been updated and will be available soon. For AZTEC courts, the AOC will be making modifications to the codes and tables. Non-AZTEC courts are responsible to update their systems. A sample letter will be sent to affected courts in March. Mr. Wilson asked for comments on the letter. The comments are as follows.

- Clarifying the use of the word “fine” versus “assessment”
- Address the difference between 1st and 2nd offense assessments
- Address the question of the courts ability to apply part of the fine to restitution in light of not being able to waive the assessments
- Address the statute’s applicability to complaint issued on or after March 13, 2004.

12. DEFENSIVE DRIVING SUBCOMMITTEE

Nothing to report.

13. STRATEGIC PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

Nothing to report.

OTHER BUSINESS

14. CALL TO PUBLIC

Judge Traynor called to the public for comment. No comment was made.

15. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: The motion was made and seconded **to adjourn the meeting at 3:10 p.m.**
Passed unanimously. **LJC-04-03**

The next LJC meeting will be held:

Wednesday, May 19, 2004
State Courts Building
1501 W. Washington St.
Conference Rooms 119 A&B

Respectfully submitted,

Ms. Susan Pickard
Staff to the Committee on Limited Jurisdiction Courts